

"THE UNIVERSITY AND I"

by

William Herbert Swift

REF

LE
3
A62
S95
1981
c.1

ARCHIVES



EX LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTÆNSIS

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA ARCHIVES

Accession No.82-53.....

Item No.1 copy 2.....

Box No. Reference shelf.....

THE UNIVERSITY AND I

BEING AN ACCOUNT OF A LIFE-TIME OF INVOLVEMENT
WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA, 1920 to 1981.

WILLIAM HERBERT SWIFT

B.A.	1924
M.A.	1927
M.ED.	1930
LL.D.	1968

THE UNIVERSITY AND I

Having just read Dr. Walter Johns' A HISTORY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA, 1908 - 1969, I have been impressed not only with the excellence of the book as a record of the growth and development of the University but also with the extent of my own familiarity with persons and events over much of the period covered, and beyond. It has emboldened me to make a statement in superlative vein to the effect that probably no other person has had such a variety of contact and involvement, over so long a period of time as myself.

I can start by saying, without much exaggeration, that I have known every president from 1908 to 1981. Dr. Henry Marshall Tory was president during the four years that I was an undergraduate. At no time was I called to his office whether for commendation, for consultation, or for discipline, but I took most of my classes in the Arts Building and frequently noted his comings and goings to and from his second floor office. I believe he shook my hand when I was presented, at the 1921 Convocation, with the prize that I had won for highest standing in first year mathematics.

Dr. Wallace was president during both my graduate study years. By this time I was less in awe of presidents and could undertake a corridor greeting. My major encounter, however, came in the spring of 1929. I was an instructor at the Olds School of Agriculture, chiefly in Third Year, which comprised junior matriculation subjects for students seeking university

entrance into agriculture.

One day there was a knock at my classroom door while a lesson in economics was in progress. Opening the door I found myself facing F.S. Grisdale, Principal and later Minister of Agriculture, H.A. Craig, Deputy Minister of Agriculture, under whose aegis the schools operated, and President Wallace. Might they come in? I was in no position to refuse. Please continue with the lesson. Recovering my composure as best I could I continued until the bell rang. Before departing Dr. Wallace complimented me on my teaching and admitted that he had learned something about the clearing-house system that he had not previously known. I believe that his visit, in addition to being fraternal, had something to do with the matriculation arrangements of the School vis-a-vis the University.

From President Kerr's time on my relations and involvements became of a more profound nature as will be revealed in what follows.

Let us return to 1920. I had graduated from the one-room high school at Tofield with grade XI in 1919, having written departmental examinations in VIII, IX, X and XI, prior to my fifteenth birthday. Just when I learned that I was to go to university I cannot recall. There had been only one student, Mary Kask, two years my senior at school, who had gone and the Kasks had moved away. The University would not accept me until I reached sixteen so I stayed out of school a year. I had no career goal, knew little of what a university had to offer, and

enrolled merely as "more school" in Arts.

My father and I visited the campus only to find that the residences were fully taken up. We were referred to Alberta College South, later St. Stephen's College, where a room was available on the fifth floor. In some ways this proved to be a happy circumstance. I continued to live there for my four undergraduate years and my two graduate years.

I consider it fortunate for these reasons. As will be surmised from the above I was quite immature, younger than most students, many of whom were first war veterans, and a bit overwhelmed by it all. In Alberta College South I found a congeniality that was good for me. In due course I found myself on its internal students' council, secretary of the council, chairman of the house committee, and in various ways a significant frog in a small pool whereas I might have been quite out of competition in the larger environment.

The university had an enrolment of roughly a thousand at that time. This was a size such that while one did not get to know all students personally most were at least familiar by sight. Similarly almost all staff, regardless of faculty, were known by sight. My extra-curricular involvements were limited. Two I particularly recall.

During the twenties an annual feature was the inter-class drama competition. Each class, freshman, sophomore, junior and senior, presented a one-act play, all on the same evening, in Convocation Hall. In my sophomore year I tried out and had

a small part. This led to further such participation and especially to the taking of parts in the annual three-act play. As a junior I played in Barrie's Dear Brutus, and in my senior year in Shaw's Fanny's First Play. Both of these were directed by Elizabeth Sterling Haynes, a name famous in drama in ever-widening circles.

The second had a peculiar twist to it. It was a requirement of the university that every first year student take physical education, a regimen of physical exercise. It was, however, possible to meet this requirement by joining the Canadian Officers Training Corps. This I did. Then I discovered that the C.O.T.C. had a band. I had a very modest competence on the baritone horn from days in the Toffield Boys Band. I switched to the band. Despite the sedentary nature of this involvement I got credit in physical education. I continued in the band voluntarily, proceeding through clarinet and saxophone. A small group of us played, it must have been in a graduate year, for skating in the covered rink, for a fee.

It was only during my junior year that I began to have some concept of what I would like to do, which led to an interview with Dr. (Dean) Kerr, later to become president. There had been one earlier consultation with him which may be used to illustrate something about curriculum in the early twenties.

Every student was required in his first year, at least in Arts, to take one of French or German and one of Latin or Greek. French and Latin were the common ones taken. The high school

situation at the time was such that many of the small high schools, one teacher units, could not offer the languages. Large numbers of students came to university deficient in languages. I was one.

Two courses, French A and Latin A, were offered, being essentially the equivalent of grade XI work in those subjects. We took these instead of the proper first year courses, which we then took in our second year. In each of the second and third years we were required to carry an extra subject to overcome our deficiencies in numbers and levels of courses. In my third year it would have been permissible for me to take second year French but this would have done me no good in terms of credit. I did not need another second year course. I had a science option to recover.

Dean Kerr himself taught a course in French Canadian Literature. The pre-requisite for it was in fact second year French. My request to him was that I be permitted to enrol based on my first year French. He granted this exception. It was not too wise actually. I was not really well enough prepared, but I made a modestly respectable mark. In retrospect I wonder why I was so anxious to get into the course. Maybe like Stephen Leacock's modern student who took Music, Turkish and Religion, it was because it gave me a comfortable time-table.

My second petition to Dean Kerr was of a more profound nature. By the end of my junior year I was beginning to think seriously of Education. There was at this time no faculty or

school of Education. The Department of Philosophy offered a few courses in psychology which were deemed to be, in part, a step towards Education in the professional sense.

There was a regulation at the time that a student must continue in his fourth year two of the subjects taken in the third, an embryonic form of majoring. In my third year, while still very uncertain as to any goal, I had taken, in addition to a second year course hanging over from my matriculation deficiencies, French Canadian Literature, European History, History of Architecture, and Geology. I now required sequent courses in two of these. There were two psychology courses, 51 and 52, which normally would have been taken as sequents, which I now wished to take. It seemed appropriate also to take Philosophy 51. I did not wish to pursue further French, History or Geology.

Dean Kerr was sympathetic to my desire to begin now to devise a program with some semblance of a goal to it. He proposed a solution that would not violate the regulation. We would regard History of Architecture as having been taken in the senior year and as being sequent to European History. We would also regard Psychology 51 as having been taken in my junior year to which Psychology 52 would now become sequent. I finished up with Classics in English, Philosophy 51, and the two Psychologies. Clearly Dr. Kerr regarded the regulations as being made for man and not man for the regulations. Flexibility is a virtue when it can be exercised with compassion and wisdom.

In May, 1924, I graduated in Arts, the degree being conferred by Chancellor Stuart. I proceeded to the Calgary Normal

School to become a teacher but it was much in my mind to return eventually for more university work. The return came sooner than I had expected.

Upon graduation from Normal School in 1925 I was appointed to be one of two teachers in Provost teaching jointly grades VIII to XII. My subjects were a pot-pourri of subjects and grade levels. One was grade XI French. Despite what I had taken at University I felt uneasy about this, especially my competence in pronunciation. Consequently I enrolled in the summer session taking conversational French from Professor Pelluet. This was scarcely a full time program so I made a start on graduate studies by enrolling in two courses which would count towards the newly established graduate program leading to a Bachelor of Education degree. The holders of this degree were subsequently granted an M.Ed. when the B.Ed. was established as an undergraduate program.

At that time the summer session arrangement was that a student studied for six weeks during the summer, writing a term test at the end. He then worked at home completing an assigned syllabus and submitting reports or whatever might be demanded. In May he attended again at the university and wrote the regular final examination in the subject.

I was successful in gaining credit in my two courses and was encouraged to attend again in 1926, getting two more subjects off in the spring of 1927. This effort won me an M.A. Later the arrangements for summer session work were changed.

Instead of post-attendance study pre-attendance study was instituted. This proved unsatisfactory. Students simply did not get down to business and came in unprepared. Eventually summer study stood entirely on the period of attendance.

After another year of teaching I decided to invest my modest savings in a full year of work towards the B.Educ., returned to St. Stephen's College, as it had become, and enrolled in a year's graduate work which was successfully accomplished.

Towards the end of that year Dr. J.M. MacRachran, Head of the Department of Philosophy and Psychology, proposed to me that I should return for another year. He said that he could obtain for me a bursary of \$500 from the Canadian Mental Health Association and another \$500 from the University in return for which I would be expected to perform services such as marking papers and essays, teaching occasional classes, and various miscellanea, seemingly not too rigorous a schedule, pursuant to which I could still take the remaining courses necessary for my degree. I accepted this offer.

In the fall of 1928 I returned as arranged. Within a few days Dr. MacRachran sought me out again. A crisis had arisen at Olds. Someone was needed at once to teach high school subjects and to act as dean of the boys' dormitory. The Department of Agriculture had appealed to the University for help. He recommended that I go. My fellowship and assistantship would be held in abeyance for me for a year. The experience would be

valuable. Over a week-end I was at Olds and teaching Monday morning. It was there that I had the inspection by President Wallace referred to earlier.

As planned I returned to the University in September, 1929, and completed the requirements for the B.Educ. degree. I performed various tasks, including some practice teaching evaluation of lessons taught by students training to become teachers of high school subjects in the newly established School of Education. For a part of each calendar year for eleven consecutive years I had been a student on the university campus.

In April of 1930 I was appointed to be an inspector of schools, temporarily at Wainwright, and permanently, in August, at Athabasca. For two or three years I had no further contact with the University.

In 1933, it may have been 1934, late in June my superiors got in touch with me. A summer school instructor had suddenly taken ill. Could I come to the summer school and teach a course?

Over many years there had operated jointly the Department of Education's Summer School for Teachers and the University's Summer Session. Teachers registered in the former could, for a time, take grade XII subjects, but more particularly courses which gave them special diplomas or credentials in primary teaching, physical education, music, drama, art, teaching methods, a considerable variety. On the University side there were offered a number of Arts and Science courses. Many a teacher proceeded to a degree by the laborious process of taking one or

two courses a year. This applied, for example, in the case of W.P. Wagner who eventually became Superintendent of Edmonton Public Schools.

Ill prepared and leaving behind summer operational schools that needed visiting and various administrative problems requiring attention I found myself once again on the campus of the University. This was the depth of the depression. The provincial government coffers were empty. Salaries had been cut, by way of a euphonious device called the voluntary contribution. Normal school instructors and inspectors of schools were required to do some summer work without the honoraria that had been previously paid. In fact I had been slated for two weeks of examination paper marking, easy work. Now I had five weeks of considerable effort to keep ahead of my classes. Further, as an economy move, per diem expense allowances were discontinued. Instead the government made a deal with St. Joseph's College to house us and provide us with meals. Any subsidiary costs were met from our own pockets.

Nevertheless the summer, as others to follow, had its pleasures. I was back on pleasant and familiar soil. I had the association not only of Department of Education colleagues but of University professors, including some of my former teachers. When I became a Normal School instructor in the fall of 1935 the summer school routine continued. The University had again become a part of my life.

Upon the conclusion of the 1937 Summer School the Swift family, hauling goods and chattels in a crude trailer of considerable proportions, set out for Stanford University. Twelve months later we were back and I now found myself a member of the staff of the Edmonton Normal School in the building which in 1981 is called Corbett Hall. Incidentally, I had known E.A. Corbett even to the extent of having served as projectionist for him when he showed in a rural setting some of the Extension Department's sets of slides.

Some time during the 1938-39 year I entered the University orbit again. Up until that time the direction of the Department of Education's Summer School had been one of the responsibilities of the Supervisor of Schools. At this time the School was growing rapidly in numbers and the Supervisor was heavily involved in curriculum revision. I was appointed Director of the Summer School, the preparatory work being carried on in conjunction with my Normal School teaching. The summer, for some six weeks, was fully devoted to the School. Holiday became minimal, but there was an honorarium of \$350.

So once again I found myself on the campus. The Director on the University side was Dr. E.W. Sheldon for the two years that I occupied my post. We had to do many things together, prepare a joint calendar, allocate classrooms, make plans for public lectures, lay the groundwork for a quickly organized students' council, and a host of other detail. Dr. Sheldon I had known well for a great many years, a delightful man, but

with one characteristic that gave me some concern. He would phone me suggesting a meeting, always held in his office. What time? What about 9:00 or 9:30? Fine. I soon discovered that regardless of the time of commencement the time of conclusion was always about noon. I learned before long to find myself busy until 10:30 or 11:00. The work got done.

On one occasion something arose that in Dr. Sheldon's opinion required consultation with President Kerr. Dr. Sheldon made an appointment for the late morning, perhaps 11:00. In any event the consultation dragged on and 12:00 approached. What we had come for had been quite settled. Finally Dr. Kerr rose from his chair and in a tone of voice which indicated that he had had quite enough advised us that the interview was at an end.

My two summers on the campus, where I used as office the temporarily vacated office of the Dean of Agriculture, were quite delightful. Not the least of the delight was my still further contacts, formal and informal, with members of the teaching staff on the University side. My noon meal was not infrequently taken in the Athabasca Hall dining room. There were social events involving staff and students. The president of the students one summer was Jim Cousins who became first dean of Lethbridge Junior College from which derived the University of Lethbridge. We had a good summer together.

At the end of the 1940 session, without holiday, we moved to Calgary where I had been appointed principal of the Normal School. I supervised the removal of our effects from the north

hill building to temporary quarters in King Edward School, for just as in Edmonton where university buildings were being taken over for the war effort the Normal School facilities became the R.C.A.F.'s #2 Wireless School.

During the next two and one half years my contacts with the University were minimal. I directed a branch of the Department's Summer School in Calgary but there was no University involvement there. I recall only one incident. Prior to the 1942 revision of the University Act there was a biennial election of members to the Senate by graduates of the University. Vacancies would be advertised and nominations received by the Registrar. Such occurred, probably in 1941. In any event somewhere within our staff there developed a proposal to nominate Dr.W.D. McDougall, one of our colleagues. Papers were obtained and completed.

In due course the names of the nominees were made public. In addition to Dr. McDougall there had been nominated Dr. H.C. Newland, Supervisor of Schools within the Department of Education, and some third person, whose name I now forget, who could also be deemed to be a part of the educational establishment. The Calgary Herald produced an editorial in which it was alleged that there had developed a conspiracy among the educationists to gain control of the Senate.

This was a nonsensical allegation. In the first place the Senate was a large body which three members could not possibly control. Secondly, they had to be elected, and if they were it

would be by a democratic process. Actually there had not been the slightest collaboration. Dr. Newland's nomination was as much a surprise to us as Dr. McDougall's was to him. We protested to the Herald but to no avail. It continued to rail against this conspiracy.

In the end the matter became of little significance for there was shortly set in motion an inquiry or study that led in 1942 to a complete reconstitution of the Senate, both as to powers and responsibilities and as to membership. Ironically, in relation to the Herald, the Supervisor of Schools became one of the statutory members.

In November of 1942, after a long illness, E.L. Fuller, Chief Inspector of Schools, died. I was invited to succeed him. I reported to Edmonton about December 1 although my official appointment was dated January 1, 1943. I was now back on the fringe of the University. Then two events occurred that brought me again into its orbit.

The first was that Dr. Newland resigned from the Department of Education. This provided the opportunity for a reorganization of the Department, long overdue for a number of reasons, including the fact that school divisions had now replaced the multiplicity of individual rural school districts, the Department's officer in each case now being a superintendent rather than an inspector. The position of Supervisor of Schools was abolished, the position of Director of Curriculum was created,

and the Chief Inspector became Chief Superintendent of Schools, with a somewhat more extensive domain. All this required amendment of the University Act providing that the Chief Superintendent would sit on the Senate instead of the Supervisor of Schools. For a short time I found myself on the Senate in this capacity.

The second was much more pervasive in its long term effects. It involved the University of Alberta General Alumni Association, with which I continued to have connections over a great many years. Perhaps early in 1945 I had a telephone call at my home. It was Guthrie Sanford whom I knew only slightly. He introduced himself as chairman of the Alumni Association nominating committee. He explained that his committee was required to nominate a president, for which office Mr. Justice H.J. Macdonald had been chosen. The committee was also required to nominate two candidates for vice-president. He had already obtained the consent of one nominee and required a second. It was perhaps not deliberate on his part but I got the impression that candidate number one was expected to be elected but that I would do him and his committee a considerable favor if I allowed my name to stand, in order that the constitutional requirement could be met. To my surprise I was elected for the then two-year term.

At that time the Alumni Association was a rather feeble organization. It relied on voluntary service entirely. Its membership comprised those who paid the modest fee. Later the University provided a paid Alumni Secretary which greatly changed the status and vigor of the organization. However, it did have one considerable responsibility. Under the 1942 Act its presi-

dent and its vice-president both served as statutory members of the Senate and of the Board of Governors, the latter being the much more responsible and time-consuming body. The Association, over the years, provided these bodies with many distinguished and able members usually for a four year stint, two as vice-president and two as president.

Hence, due to my election, I found myself on Senate and Board. I continued on the latter for a total of over twenty-one years, being also an ex-officio member when I became Deputy Minister of Education in 1946. For some time I technically had two seats, but I was never accorded more than one vote.

At this point reference may well be made to two incidents involving the chancellorship, since the Association was to some extent involved.

The offices of Chancellor and of President at the University of Alberta have a relationship not unlike that of Governor-General and Prime Minister at Ottawa. The Chancellor is the ceremonial head of the University. The office is one of much dignity, the holder of which is accorded great deference within university circles.

The Act of 1966 provided that the Chancellor should be selected by the Senate. Under the previous Act, however, the Chancellor was elected by Convocation, that is by the graduates of the University. As the University grew this procedure became, if an election were necessary because of there being more than one candidate, extremely cumbersome and of questionable validity.

There was no voters' list. Contact with the electorate was difficult and inadequate.

To the best of my knowledge there had not been an actual election with respect to the early Chancellors. Some sort of consensus was reached among the prestigious persons and it was "arranged".

In the year 1946 the chancellorship of Mr. Justice Ford was due to expire. I had been a member of the Senate, over which he presided, and a member of the Board of Governors from 1945, as vice-president of the Alumni Association. In April of 1946 I became entitled to a second seat on the Board by virtue of being Deputy Minister of Education.

Not long after I became Deputy Minister I received a delegation in my office. It consisted of Henry Spencer, President of the Alberta School Trustees Association, George Andrews, its Secretary, John Barnett, Executive Secretary of the Alberta Teachers' Association, and a fourth not now remembered, probably someone from the A.T.A. Executive.

Henry Spencer was the spokesman. He said that the group was interested in promoting as a candidate for the chancellorship my predecessor in the deputy-ministership, Dr. G. Fred McNally. They sought my advice as to how to proceed and, if I felt so inclined, my association with them in their proposal.

Dr. McNally was an original member of Convocation, had obtained his M.A. from the University, had sat on Senate and Board of Governors, and was in a great many respects an honored

and respected member of the community. He was very well known throughout the province.

I agreed that Dr. McNally was a worthy candidate for the office, and that election as Chancellor would be a well-earned culmination to a distinguished career. I quoted from my University Act the procedure as outlined, especially that a nomination form had to be obtained and signed by a number of members of Convocation. It was agreed to proceed with the project.

I indicated that in my opinion it would be a courtesy to the President, Dr. Newton, to let him know that the nomination was pending. There was general agreement to this and I was asked to inform Dr. Newton.

Forthwith I sought audience with the President and attended at his office. There I told him of the delegation that had visited me and of the intention to nominate Dr. McNally. As I unfolded my short story I sensed that Dr. Newton was unhappy with it, and in fact began to look extremely embarrassed.

When I had finished, or perhaps before I had fully dealt with Dr. McNally's qualifications, he informed me that the question of the succession of the chancellorship had already been determined. I was taken aback and reacted a bit more vigorously than was my usual wont. How could this be? The statute provided a procedure for the election of a Chancellor. How could the Chancellor already have been selected?

He then told me that the current Chancellor, the Chairman of the Board, Mr. Justice Parlee, and he, President, had already

decided that the position should be filled by Mr. Justice H. I then informed him that illustrious and important as these personages were they had no authority to take unto themselves the determination of a successor and that they were presumptuous in assuming that whomever they decided should be Chancellor would automatically become such. The air was a bit strained. I am sure that Dr. Newton realized fully that he had got into an untenable position.

At this point I reported to those who had initiated the McNally nomination and also went to see the President of The Alumni Association which at the time was a still further member of the Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Hugh John Macdonald. Hugh John was an admirer of Dr. McNally. He was also a colleague of the proposed Justice. He decided to be neutral and not be involved, at the same time indicating that he would not be averse to seeing Dr. McNally's name put in nomination whether as a single candidate, or as one of two or more, requiring an election.

Our little group proceeded to nominate Dr. McNally in the manner required by the statute. No other nomination was forthcoming and he became Chancellor by acclamation.

Some years later in a conversation with a distinguished alumnus of the University resident in Toronto, also an admirer of Dr. McNally, I told him of the circumstances above related. He expressed surprise and stated that he and some others had nominated Dr. McNally, that he knew nothing of our nomination and had always supposed that he had been the Chancellor maker.

Apparently there were, in fact, two sets of nomination papers for the same candidate. Our candidate proved to be a very popular and active Chancellor.

In speculating a bit on the above events I persuaded myself, though proof would be impossible, that the leader of the coterie was doubtless the retiring Chancellor, Mr. Justice Ford. He probably first persuaded Mr. Justice Parlee, for whom I had an extremely high regard, and then brought in President Newton as an acquiescing third. It did surprise me, however, that Dr. Newton allowed himself to get into the unhappy position in which he found himself.

As the term of office of Dr. McNally was nearing its end the then President of the Alumni Association interested himself in the succession. He was Dr. Angus McGougan, Director of the University Hospital. By virtue of his presidency he was a member of the Senate and of the Board of Governors. I was still a member of the Alumni executive by virtue of being the most recent available past-president. The actual immediate past-president had become incapacitated.

Angus assembled the executive and holding that the executive of the Alumni was the nearest thing there was to a voice of Convocation, the graduates, proposed that we nominate a candidate for the chancellorship. He proposed the name of Dr. Earle Scarlett of Calgary. Not only was he persuaded that Dr. Scarlett was an extremely worthy candidate but he thought it would be fitting to have someone from Calgary and someone from a further

profession, medicine.

Dr. Scarlett had sat on the Board for two terms and had been an interested and conscientious member. I had developed a high regard for him and was quite willing to agree to this candidacy. The rest of the executive also agreed and so we, particularly Angus, proceeded with the nomination.

In this case, however, it was not a shoo-in. Nominations were completed for Dr. M.E. Lazerte, recently retired Dean of Education, and Judge L.Y. Cairns who was a very early graduate and had served the University in a variety of ways. All were well qualified and deserving. Having put in Dr. Scarlett's name we undertook a campaign of letter writing and other means of publicizing our candidate, who in the end was elected and served with distinction. L.Y. Cairns made it, unopposed, on the next round.'

It may be appropriate, also, to mention at this point the inclusion of the Normal Schools within the University which occurred in 1945. These events overlapped my being Chief Inspector of Schools, Chief Superintendent of Schools, and Deputy Minister. The initiative and involvement of the Department resided primarily with the Deputy Minister, Dr. McNally, and the Supervisor of Schools, Dr. Newland. The Normal Schools were under the latter's immediate supervision.

As a former Normal School principal, and as the third of the Department's triad of senior officers I was frequently involved in the discussions. In particular I played some part in

the development and the documentation of the details, including the Board of Teacher Education and Certification, the body designed to provide for formal consultation and liaison between University and Government, with representation also from the Alberta Teachers' Association. In due course I served as chairman of it providing opportunity to get to know, or know better, various members of the faculty who served thereon.

Many problems and quirks arose as a result of the integration of the Normal School staffs within the Faculty of Education. All were accepted regardless of their academic acceptability to the Dean and others. Not too long after I became Deputy Minister a former instructor, who had become associate professor, called on me to protest the treatment they were receiving in some respect. Something had been lost, I now forget what. I pointed out to him a number of respects in which advantage had accrued. He could not expect to have it both ways. On balance he, they, had profited considerably. He was not fully placated but left resigned to his fate. Two further integration problems will be referred to later.

On April 1, 1946 I became Deputy Minister of Education and in that capacity an ex-officio member of the Board of Governors. In Dr. Walter Johns' History he refers to the Newton Years, the Stewart Years and the Johns Years. I was on the Board for most of the Newton years, all the Stewart years, and most of the Johns years. The events of those years are detailed in the History and need no repeating here. I was, in many ways, a part

of them as they came before the Board, or a committee thereof. There follow, however, a number of observations and recollections relating to matters in which I was particularly involved.

The statute made no provision for a vice-chairman of the Board. Probably a vice-chairman could have been chosen but this did not happen during my time on the Board. There were, inevitably, times when the Chairman was not present for meetings, whether of the Board or its executive committee. Early I found myself chosen, on an ad hoc basis, to preside, and eventually became de facto if not de jure vice-chairman. Similarly with respect to the executive committee I was early placed thereon and continued in that capacity until I left the Board. Although these increased my involvement, while occupying an office heavy enough in its own right, I had much satisfaction from being a part of the unfolding events, and from the pleasant contacts with people. A member of the Board received no financial remuneration.

As is indicated in Dr. Johns' History the University grew by leaps and bounds in the fifties and sixties. This greatly increased the amount of business coming before the Board and its committees. This necessitated changes in the manner of conducting business. More and more came to be referred to the executive committee, or transferred to it as being somewhat routine. This made for more and longer executive meetings, and the Board meetings themselves became longer. A single illustration will indicate what happened.

When I joined the Board early in Dr. Newton's regime the appointment of a new member of the faculty was an event. The President would have with him a file, a curriculum vitae, covering the candidate. His qualifications and experience would be described. He, the President, would be questioned and in due course the recommendation would be approved. During the latter part of Dr. Johns' time only the appointments of very senior persons, vice-presidents or deans, would come to the whole Board. Others came to the executive. The President would have a list, several pages of candidates, all of whom had been considered by staff committees and were being recommended. Was the President satisfied that all of these were fit and proper persons, or at least the best that could be secured in the difficult academic market of the time? He was. Approved. President Horowitz, 1981, informed me that now such appointments do not come to the Board at all. If within budget they are approved, under general authority of the Board, at some administrative level.

Under the 1942 University Act among the ex-officio members of the Board were the Deputy Provincial Treasurer and the Deputy Minister of Education. It was perhaps inevitable that there would be those who were suspicious of this intrusion of governmental presence. Presumably these functionaries were there to spy, to control, to apply the brakes.

My predecessor, Dr. McNally, had been a member of the Board from 1942 to 1946. I was fairly close to him in the perfor-

mance of his duties. I never had reason to believe that he was in any way under government surveillance or direction in his Board membership. This was completely so in my own case. I was a member of the Board like any other. I did not report after Board meetings to anyone. I did not consult prior to going to Board meetings. In fact the communication with the government, when this was necessary, was between the Chairman and President, on the University side, and the Premier, or a cabinet committee, on the government side. Occasionally, but not frequently, I was present at such meetings.

The Deputy Treasurer was a slightly different matter. During my first years he simply did not attend meetings. When I questioned him about this he said, in effect, that the way in which the University spent money wildly, so angered him that he could not stand it. He turned up for the budget meeting but was so ill informed that he was not of much use. He probably lost several nights sleep after it. The next Deputy Provincial Treasurer, F.G. Stewart, on the contrary, was a faithful attender. He, too, at times felt that fiscal responsibility had been replaced by enthusiasm but he was a valuable member of the Board.

The problem of support for a university from public funds is ever present and has no ultimate solution. The desires of the university community are limitless. There is no way of determining, other than arbitrarily, what is necessary as opposed to what may be desirable but of less or little urgency. What seems urgent to one person seems frivolous to another. Conflicts

in these respects are as evident in 1981 as they were in the fifties or the sixties. In my experience government has always had to say, eventually, this much and no more, and leave it to the universities themselves to fight out internally the allocations. Actually, comparatively, Alberta universities have over many years been more generously treated than those in other provinces, chiefly, I suppose, because Alberta has been more liberally endowed with revenues.

There now follow a number of incidents which while not necessarily of great consequence were ones in which I had some special involvement. Let us return to the integration of the Normal Schools into the Faculty of Education.

Prior to 1945 the Faculty (erstwhile School, then College) had been a small show offering a one year course of teacher training to university graduates who wished to become high school teachers. Its faculty still consisted of three, the dean and two others. Overnight it absorbed the staffs of two Normal Schools and had an increase of students many fold. Dr. Lazerte became dean not of a minor faculty but of a major one, by comparison. He and his administration moved to the Edmonton Normal School building, south of the main campus.

In his biography of Dr. Lazerte, who had a varied and vigorous career which persisted long after his official retirement, Chalmers tells something of the problems faced, and particularly of the reaction of Dr. Lazerte to the new situation. In particular he developed, so it was alleged by his colleagues,

a possessiveness, a withdrawal into an inner sanctum, that limited communication and created a feeling of alienation among the new staff in particular.

At the time that the integration took place G.F. Manning was principal at Calgary. He and the other instructors became university faculty with rank determined by the level of their salaries at the time, a fair enough solution. Manning became an associate professor. Lazerte, naturally, relied upon him to manage the Calgary show. Nevertheless Lazerte maintained that it was in no respect independent, that it was an integral part of a total faculty, of which he was dean. Manning was given no title that indicated in any way that he had administrative charge. He was simply Associate Professor Manning.

An operation the size of the Calgary one simply had to have someone in charge, and visibly in charge, to deal with the public, the students, the Department of Public Works staff, timetables, discipline, the host of day to day details and problems. Manning approached Lazerte for clarification, and some kind of status. Lazerte was adamant that there could not be two persons in charge and that he was dean, although 200 miles removed.

In due course Manning came to see me, I suppose in three capacities, as a former principal who had some appreciation of the situation, as a member of the Board, and as a friend and former colleague. In my opinion the situation was quite intolerable.

I brought the matter to the Board, no doubt having talked

to the President first. The upshot was that despite Dr. Lazerte's opposition an administrative title was granted to Manning, giving him some status and some local authority. The evolution of Calgary from complete dependence on Edmonton to autonomy as a separate university is a long and interesting story.

The second matter affecting Education was a bit similar. Other faculties of the university, of any size, had departments and department heads. Although Education was now a large one it was unitary, everything being under the close control and direction of the dean. This caused discontent for two reasons. First, it was felt that far too much had to go to the dean for his personal attention, with resultant delay. Surely some matters could be delegated, or to greater degree. Second, the faculty was denied the opportunities for promotion, with modest honoraria, to positions intermediate between professor and dean that existed elsewhere in the university. Again I was approached by interested parties. It was true that in the Education faculty the lines were not as clear cut as to department boundaries as with other disciplines. Nevertheless it seemed to me that some sort of hierarchical structure was desirable and warranted. I brought the matter forward. The upshot, a kind of compromise, was that there should be established three chairmanships, elementary education, secondary education, and educational psychology. Three senior staff persons were appointed and they became members of General Faculty Council. In the fullness of time departments with heads were brought into being.

A very happy event in the history of the University was the awarding in 1949 to Reg Lister of the title and status of Honorary Member of Convocation. The genesis of this is probably not recorded in the minutes of the University.

Reg Lister had worked as a youth on the first building on the campus. Later he became a member of the janitorial staff. As the campus grew his domain became limited to the residences. He and his wife lived in a little house behind them. Reg was more than a janitor, or head caretaker. He was a kind of unofficial advisor to men students, quiet disciplinarian, and generally beloved and respected. Eventually he was given the title of Superintendent of Residences.

Often before a Board meeting reconvened after lunch there would be informal conversations. It was revealed, probably by President Newton, that there was a move afoot to honor Reg in recognition of his long and illustrious service to the University. The readily available means was by way of the awarding on LL.D., the prerogative of the Senate. There was, it appeared, some hesitancy about making such an award to Reg. To some it did not seem quite appropriate.

At this point I suggested that Reg be made an Honorary Member of Convocation. Dr. Newton asserted that there was no such thing. To this I agreed but said that in my opinion the Board was master and could do it if it wished, and that in any event I could not conceive of objection coming from any source. The board as a whole considered this a happy solution and the

necessary steps were taken. Reg was delighted. He was on the Convocation platform among all the dignitaries. He was installed with much formality. Everyone was pleased and there were no scoffers. To the best of my knowledge Reg, now deceased, was the only person to attain to this distinction.

Some of the above incidents reveal one of my functions or my contributions to the Board, that of the producer of solutions. An eastern Canada associate once referred to me as the facilitator.

Seldom were there votes, in any confrontational sense. Motions came after discussion rather than before in most cases, perhaps not "according to Bourinot" but it worked well. After routine business had been disposed of the President would turn to the items on the agenda requiring some serious consideration and decision. He would outline the problem, the question or the proposal. Discussion would then proceed with as many members as desirous of doing so contributing. It became more like a committee of the whole than a formal board meeting. These discussions sometimes continued for a considerable time with contradictory or divergent views being expressed. In this I would participate. Eventually it would appear that the original proposal was not acceptable to all, and that counter proposals or negative views were not acceptable either. At this stage, while debate was still going on, I would prepare a motion, writing it out on scratch pad paper. When opportunity presented I would indicate to the chairman that I had written out a draft motion

that I thought might be acceptable to the Board, that was as near as possible to the consensus that seemed to be taking form. Almost inevitably such motions were accepted, perhaps with minor amendment, and the Board went on to other business.

While it is a complete irrelevance I recall the similar service rendered by Allan Watson of Lethbridge. For many years he was superintendent of public schools. Upon retirement he served for a number of years as secretary-treasurer of the district and its board. In consultation with the chairman he would prepare the agenda for board meetings. With respect to difficult or controversial matters he would prepare in advance as many as three draft motions bearing on a subject. Discussion would continue for some time. When a consensus seemed to be arising he would produce the draft motion that most nearly represented it and pass it to the chairman. It was usually accepted. Watson, it will be seen, carried my procedure a step farther. It was a great time saver.

There follow now a number of items which relate my involvement with the University and its officers and staff not arising from membership on the Board.

As Chief Superintendent of Schools, and for a short time as Deputy Minister, I presided over a body called The High School and University Matriculation Examinations Board. This was comprised of three or four senior university people, three from the Department of Education, a city school superintendent, and a

representative of the Alberta Teachers Association. The precise roster varied a bit from time to time. Its purpose was, chiefly, to develop policy with respect to the departmental examinations, by this time limited to Grade XII.

From my point of view a personal benefit accrued in that it provided an association, both formal and informal, with university people, especially the heads of some of the related departments, Dr. Walker, Chemistry, Dr. Wyman, Mathematics, and many others.

The Western Board of Music had been established well before my becoming Deputy Minister. It was an examining body for pupils taking lessons from private teachers, chiefly piano but also in other forms. Its intent was to have such a service based in western Canada, which had been completely dependent upon the Toronto Conservatory and one or two other examining bodies. The Board comprised the university presidents of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, the three deputy ministers, and three persons from the respective departments of music at the universities. Without demeaning the importance of the organization I felt that its governing body was a bit more high-powered than was necessary. We met each year in February, rotationally at the several universities. It became a social as well as a business event through which I came to know several university presidents, Gilson, Saunderson, Thomson, Thompson, Spinks and others.

Perhaps the best feature of these meetings was that the respective participants would meet informally in their own groups for discussions of matters other than music. Less musically inclined or endowed members sometimes learned something of importance. For example, at Winnipeg, on one occasion, we were informed that after the usual lunch, we would be entertained by an oboe quartet from the music department. This sounded intriguing. My Saskatchewan counterpart and I commented upon the unusual circumstance of finding such a concentration of players of the hautboy. Our ignorance was revealed when there appeared one oboe and three strings. We learned that in musical parlance an oboe, clarinet, horn, or whatever, quartet means only that one of the standard members of a string quartet has been replaced by a non-string.

A major involvement over an extended period was as co-chairman of a committee, usually called the Articulation Committee, but officially titled the Joint Committee to Co-ordinate University and High School Curricula. The other chairman was Dean John Macdonald of Arts and Science. Its membership comprised seven university people, the majority being deans, three from the Department of Education, and representatives of the Alberta Teachers Association, the Alberta School Trustees Association, the Alberta Federation of Home and School Associations, and of city school systems.

The matriculation requirements of the university and of various faculties were perhaps the major concern. These were, at the time, quite rigorous, seven Grade XII examination sub-

jects being required. A considerable body of opinion had arisen that some of the requirements were unnecessary. This may be illustrated by one incident. The Director of the School of Household Economics was before us. To enter this school a girl, all entrants were girls at the time, had to present seven subjects inclusive of grade XII algebra and grade XII trigonometry and analytical geometry. In the course of the discussion I asked the Director why these two mathematics courses, which many found extremely difficult, and if they passed at all did so in the most non-understanding way, were required. They did not seem to be prerequisite to any part of the household economics program. She pondered the question briefly and then replied, "It has always been that way."

Clearly, many of the matters coming before the committee were controversial. Interestingly enough, however, the most serious clashes took place among the university representatives, liberals versus conservatives. In the end various revisions were recommended and accepted. The standard matriculation became six rather than seven subjects and greater flexibility as to subjects presented was introduced.

During this on-going effort I received a letter from a community leader in Red Deer who had had some prominence in the Home and School Federation. She demanded to be sent copies of the minutes of our meetings. From her letter I read between the lines that she was sure that there was a sharp line of division between the university people on the one hand and the

iconoclasts and Huns on the other. I had to advise her that I could not do this without the consent of the other co-chairman, and that the official minutes were, in fact, at the University, where all meetings were held. Since she seemed, also, to want to know who voted for what, I had to tell her that business was not conducted by way of formal votes but by discussion leading to a consensus, which would then be recorded. I told her also that, as noted above, the most intense skirmishes took place within the university group. She was somewhat surprised to learn these things but seemed content. Many people, including newspaper reporters, find it difficult to understand that serious, difficult and complex matters can be discussed and resolved in a non-confrontational manner.

Dr. Johns in his History makes brief reference to assistance given by the Kellogg Foundation which led to a rapid growth of courses, especially graduate courses, in educational administration. This actually had a very considerable series of events behind it. They are described in some detail in the book Education^{al} Administration in Canada: A Memorial to A.W. Reeves written by myself under instructions from the Faculty of Education.

Very briefly, the Canadian Education Association, an organization in which I was very much involved over many years, obtained from the Foundation a considerable grant to initiate a program of short courses and other activities designed to en-

hance the vocation of educational administrators and to improve the qualifications of its practitioners. I became chairman of the Interim Committee and subsequently chairman of the continuing Management Committee. In May 1953 the first short course, with subsidized attendance of school inspectors and superintendents from across Canada, was held on the University campus. Further courses were held in Edmonton and later in Banff where the School of Fine Arts was still a part of the University of Alberta. The Dean of Education and members of his staff were much involved. As chairman of the Management Committee I had much contact with the courses.

The original proposal to the Kellogg Foundation had contained an intention to see established in Canada a graduate program in educational administration which would have status and which would make it possible for aspirants to higher studies and degrees to pursue these without the necessity of going to the United States which had been very much the practice. In due course the University of Alberta, with further aid from the Foundation, including some subsidization of students for a time, assumed this responsibility. It was natural that it should do so because it had become so fully involved in the CFA-Kellogg project. In any event, I, along with others, prepared the groundwork for this very considerable development on the U. of A. campus.

After Ph.D. programs were well established and candidates were coming forward with some regularity I was invited on three occasions to serve as external examiner. The significance of

this resides in the University's rule that the examining committee must contain one person who is not a member of the local faculty. In the main someone comes from another university campus.

1958 was Golden Jubilee Year for the University. As one aspect of the celebrations the Alumni Association established its Golden Jubilee Award, to be conferred annually on someone deemed to have made a significant contribution to the University. The first recipient was Dr. G. Fred McNally, my predecessor as Deputy Minister, and at the time Chancellor. Three years later, 1961, I was the recipient of the award, in itself an indication that my life had been much intertwined with the development of the University.

In 1966 I ceased to be a member of the Board of Governors. Following much in the way of hearings, consultations, representations, a new act, The Universities Act, 1966, was passed by the Legislative Assembly, effective April 1. It provided for the continuation of the University of Alberta, the establishment of a separate University of Calgary, and the possibility of further universities. It provided also for the coming into existence of a Universities Commission, to act as intermediary between government and universities with a variety of functions and authorities.

I had played a considerable part in the development of the new Act, the policies and decisions being, of course, the pre-

rogative of the government. I drafted the bill within which the Legislative Counsel found little to modify. I was then asked by the government to become first Chairman and bring the Commission into existence.

A few words about Calgary are desirable. As has been indicated above the first step was taken when the Calgary Normal School became a part of the Faculty of Education in 1945, twenty-one years previously. Over those years a number of changes occurred. The operation became a Branch. It had a Director, later a Principal, and finally a President, even though it was still part of the University of Alberta. It made for a peculiar situation in which there was the main president, in charge of the whole and the regional president with certain local powers and responsibilities. The status of the faculty at Calgary gradually changed, with more authority over courses and procedures at the local campus being granted.

Through the fifties and into the sixties there built up an increasing demand for autonomy, from within the staff and among vocal Calgarians. The gradual changes noted above were, in part, by way of appeasement. In the main the Edmonton (Alberta) establishment did not wish to see the dismemberment of a university having a province-wide domain. There were precedents. The University of California, head office in Sacramento, had a number of campuses, some of great size. Oregon and Montana had super-administrations with control over several campuses.

It seemed to me, however, having regard to the increasing

responsibilities being transferred to Calgary, and the general climate of opinion there, that the time for autonomy had come. Consequently prior to a board meeting I telephoned the chairman of the board, C.M. Macleod, and informed him that it was my intention to raise at the meeting the question of autonomy for Calgary. I think this must have been the meeting of 29 January, 1964, referred to by Johns on page 362 of his History. In due course I proposed a motion, which called for the matter to be studied. There was considerable discussion as might well be expected. In the main the board seemed favorable to some action but there were differences of view as to details. The upshot was that one of the Calgary members of the board and I were designated to work out a revised draft to be brought back after lunch. This we did. To my surprise, and annoyance, the Calgary member immediately moved the revised motion, so in the official minutes it stands, being in a sense the inception of the University of Calgary, in his name rather than mine.

A committee under Mr. Justice Hugh John Macdonald was set up, the first of a number of groups that got into the act, and eventually the government itself, with the result that The Universities Act, 1966, came into force.

The question as to how universities or campuses should be interrelated and how related to government was by no means unique to Alberta. In Saskatchewan the Edmonton-Calgary scenario was being repeated, Saskatoon-R Regina, although a few years and interim solutions behind. In due course there was set up an

arrangement whereby there was one board of governors and one president but with a principal for each campus. The president ceased to have day to day involvement in the affairs of either campus.

President Spinks, whom I had met at a number of meetings, came to Edmonton to speak at a University of Saskatchewan Alumni Branch dinner, which I attended accompanying my wife. He devoted his address to a comparison of the Alberta and Saskatchewan solutions, indicating quite vigorously that Alberta had made a mistake in setting up autonomous universities. After the meeting I sought him out, not to argue, but only to say that I was prepared to predict that within a few years, perhaps five, pressures would so mount, as they had done in Calgary, that Regina would become an independent campus. He naturally, was somewhat derisive of my view. The people of Saskatchewan had too much good sense to allow that to happen. But happen it did, and within a very few years.

As Chairman of the Universities Commission for two years I continued to have intimate relations with the University of Alberta, as well as developing such with Calgary and Lethbridge, the latter being very quickly organized. There were many meetings with presidents, business officers, members of the several boards of governors, concerning distribution of grants, approval of new faculties or departments, capital projects, distribution of assets, and many more. They need not be detailed

here.

The establishment of the Universities Commission form of university-government liaison was of much interest across Canada. I was invited by the staff association of Manitoba to come and describe. Twice I attended meetings of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. Johns refers to the attempt of the Commission to arrive at a formula which would be equitable for the division of the sum of money made available by the government among the three universities, each having different characteristics, and each convinced that it had one or more very special cases or needs. At one of these meetings I described what we had arrived at by way of a formula. I then stated that we were working on a further formula, one that would produce an "index of dissatisfaction". After completing our allocations we would then apply this formula. If each university was equally dissatisfied we would know that our work had been well done. In the end proof of reasonable satisfaction with my, our, efforts, was provided in that each university in turn, Alberta, Calgary and Lethbridge, awarded me an honorary doctorate.

In 1968 I retired from the Commission. My involvement with the University of Alberta came to an official end. Yet the associations lingered on. I was engaged by the Faculty of Education to serve as an ad hoc secretary in connection with a university-wide study that had been undertaken concerning purposes, philosophy and curricula. I was engaged to write the book referred to above. I was appointed by the University

as its member of an arbitration committee set up to examine into a staff dismissal.

Beyond that I continue to receive invitations to convocations and to other events, many of which I attend. Until complete incapacity overtakes me I expect to continue to be a minor participant in some aspects of university life. Two sons have graduated from the university and currently two granddaughters are in attendance through whom I have a vicarious involvement again in student life.

Edmonton, Alberta,
December, 1981

William Herbert Swift,
Deputy Minister of Education
1946-66
Chairman, Universities
Commission, 1966-68.

DATE DUE SLIP

FOR LIBRARY USE ONLY

F255



University of Alberta Library



0 1620 0476 6331